

REMARKS

Claims 1-22, 43, and 44 are canceled. Claims 35 and 37 – 42 are withdrawn. Claims 23-34 and 36 are pending. Claims 23, 25, 31, and 34 are amended with this paper.

Priority

In accordance with 35 U.S.C. §119(e) and 35 U.S.C. §120, the Applicants have submitted an amendment containing a specific reference to the prior filed applications in the section above entitled "In the Specification".

Drawings Objection

The drawings are objected to for failing to show the "motor-pump aggregate" that was described in claim 25. In lieu of amending the drawings Applicant has amended Claim 25 to correct the terminology. The "motor-pump aggregate" verbiage is now changed to "hydraulic pump (26)" which is shown in the drawings. It is believed that such an amendment overcomes the drawing objection.

Claim Objections

Claims 23-34 and 36 are objected to because of the following informalities: in line 2 from the bottom of claim 23 the phrase "separation valve (27-30)" should be changed because the term separation valve is singular but there are a plurality of numbers associated with the singular separation valve term.

Appropriate correction has been made.

Claim 31 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

Appropriate correction has been made.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §112

Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 34 has been amended to clarify the association between the plurality of separation valves and their associated wheel brakes.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

Claims 23, 29, 32, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5568962 to Enomoto et al. in view of US Patent 5069508 to Maehara and 6007162 to Hinz et al. and US Patent 3133611 to Halsey et al.

Independent Claim 23 is amended to clarify that the valve block receives a plurality of pressure sensors (9,10), as well as the brake pressure sensor (8). Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Enomoto, Maehara, Hinz and Haley does not provide such a structure. Since the cited combination of references does not provide all of the elements of amended Claim 23 Applicant respectfully submits that the combination does not serve as a basis for a prima facie showing of obviousness. For this reason it is believed that independent Claim 23 is now in a condition for allowance.

The remaining claims depend either directly or indirectly from Claim 23 and are therefore believed to be in a condition for allowance for at least the same reason as Claim 23.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicant believes that the claims as amended overcome the raised objections and rejections and are in a condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

/Edwin W. Bacon, Jr./

Edwin W. Bacon, Jr.
Registration No. 39,098
Continental Automotive Systems, Inc.
One Continental Drive
Auburn Hills, MI 48326
(248) 393-6405
Attorney for Applicants